

Remarks

Reconsideration of the application in view of the above amendments and the following remarks is requested.

Claim Amendments:

Claim 18 (as opposed to 17 as cited in the final Office Action) and claim 38 are amended to correct the informalities cited.

Claim 15 has been amended to depend from claim 14.

Claim 34 has been amended to clarify that the data manager is configured for creating the data object corresponding to the message.

No new matter has been added as a result of the amendments submitted herewith.

I. Claim Objections

The Examiner rejected claims 18 and 38 as containing informalities.

Claims 18 and 38 have been amended to correct the informalities noted.

I. Claim Rejections – 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)

The Examiner rejected claims 1-12, 14, 19-29, 31, 35-36 and 38 as being unpatentable over Hulai in view of Carroll (Applicant herein adopts the terminology of the cited references as used in the previous Office Action).

Claim 1

The Examiner writes that Hulai discloses “generating a screen element from the screen element definition to include the data object field value according to the format of the data field definition as defined in the mapped data component.”

The Examiner cited specific passages of Hulai for this proposition including:

- Figure 4, element 48 and the corresponding description at paragraph [0049] lines 1-7;
- Figure 5, elements 48, 54, 56, 58 and the corresponding description at paragraphs [0078]-[0079];
- Figure 8 and the corresponding description at paragraph [0091] lines 6-11;
- paragraph [0095] lines 1-6;
- paragraph [0098]; and
- Figure 12 and the corresponding description at paragraph [0114].

The Applicant has reviewed Hulai in detail and submits that Hulai does not disclose “generating a screen element from the screen element definition to include the data object field value”

Figure 4 and the corresponding description in Hulai disclose a user interface definition which “describes the screens that are presented to the user, along with how the user navigates from screen to screen and the actions that the application should take in response to user input” (see Figure 4). The corresponding description (paragraph [0049]) describes the format of screens and the format of data. Nowhere is “generating a screen element ... to include data object field value” disclosed.

Figure 5 and the corresponding description (paragraphs [0078]-[0079]) only disclose example user interface descriptions (elements 48, 54, 46) contained in a master definition file (element 58).

The master definition file is for “a given server side application” and “contains example user interface descriptions 48, 54, 46 for each possible mobile device 10. 30. 32; descriptions of the network transactions 50 that are possible and data descriptions 52 of the data to be stored locally on the mobile device. Preferably,

the ... data descriptions 52 will be the same for all mobile devices ...” (paragraph [0078]).

The data description (element 52) is defined in paragraph [0049] as “defining the format of data to be stored on the mobile device by the application.” The format of data is not the same thing (and does not include) the data object field value.

Paragraph [0091] describes Figure 8: “an XML message ... is sent to middleware server 44. The name of the application is specified in the message. The middleware server 44, in response, queries its database for the user interface definition for the selected application for user’s mobile device. Thereafter, the middleware server creates the application definition file Then, middleware server 44 send to the mobile device the created application definition file 28.”

Nowhere in this passage is there a mention of “generating a screen element ... to include the data object field value.” This passage describes a user interface definition and application definition file but no data object field value is included in any generated screen element as claimed.

Similarly, paragraph [0095] describes generating instances of object classes such as buttons, menus, list boxes, and choice items, etc. These are not “data object field values” as claimed.

Paragraph [0098] refers to elements S808, S818, S828, S838 and S848 which refer to creating button objects, edit box objects, menu objects, list box objects and choice item objects respectively. None of the objects include “data object field values” as claimed.

Finally, Figure 12 and the corresponding description at paragraph [0114] refer to a screen on a mobile device on which screen items is referenced by an XML segment giving rise to the screen element. However, neither the screen element or the screen item are data object field values.

Therefore, nowhere in Hulai is there any teaching of “generating a screen element ... to include the data object field value” as claimed.

For at least the above reasons, Applicant traverses the rejection of claim 1, and respectfully submits that claim 1 as amended is patentable over the Hulai and Carroll references cited by the Examiner.

Similar arguments apply for independent claims 18, 35, 36 and 38. Applicant traverses these rejections and submits that claims 18, 35, 36 and 38 are patentable over the Hulai and Carroll references cited by the Examiner.

Dependent Claims 15-17 and 32-34

Claims 15-17 and 32-34 were rejected under 35USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hulai in view of Carroll and further in view of Saulpaugh. These dependent claims incorporate the limitations of the respective independent claim from which they depend, and Applicant submits that these claims are patentable, at least with regard to the arguments pertaining to the Carroll reference above.

Dependent Claims 13 and 30

Claims 13 and 30 were rejected under 35USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hulai in view of Carroll and further in view Greene. These dependent claims incorporate the limitations of the respective independent claim from which they depend, and Applicant submits that these claims are patentable, at least with regard to the arguments pertaining to the Carroll reference above.

Conclusion

For all of the reasons set out above, Applicant respectfully submits that the application in its presently amended form is in condition for allowance and action toward that goal is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

/Henry Ohab/

Henry Ohab
Registration No. 45,854
416 862 3593

Gowling Lafleur Henderson LLP
1 First Canadian Place, Suite 1600
Toronto, Ontario
M5X 1G5

TOR_LAW\7180214\1